



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/378,217	08/19/1999	JEFFRY JOVAN PHILYAW	PHLY-24.707	8857

25883 7590 11/24/2003

HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
P.O. BOX 741715
DALLAS, TX 75374-1715

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

17

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

sk

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/378,217

Applicant(s)

PHILYAW ET AL.

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment C, received on 09/26/2003, has been entered. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of Philyaw et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,615,268. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the context of the claimed invention is the similar as the context of the cited claims of the U.S. Patent No. 6,615,268.

4. All the claims 1-10 of the application have similar limitations to claims 1-9 of Philyaw et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,615,268 except the limitation "embedding a unique perceivable code, which does not containing routing information". Therefore, claims 1-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,268 and in view of Wolzien, Patent No. 5,761,606 for the limitation "embedding a unique perceivable code, which does not containing routing information".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2176

6. Claims 1, 4-5, 6, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bendinelli et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,061,719 in view of Ullman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,018,768, and further in view of Wolzien, U.S. Patent No. 5,761,606.

7. As to claim 1, Bendinelli et al. (Bendinelli) discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

the unique code in close association with vendor information (col. 2, line 51 – col. 3, line 12 and col. 3, line 57 – col. 4, line 13: teaches a URL or other type of network information identifier which identifies a web site (vendor information));

extracting the unique code with an extractor during output of the recorded information to a user at a user location disposed on a network (col. 3, line 13 – col. 4, line 13 and col. 5, line 57 – col. 6, line 11: teaches a decoder extracts and embedded URL or other type of network information identifier from a closed caption stream (output information) and delivers it to a computer via a suitable connection (network));

in response to extracting the unique code, transmitting the unique code to a remote location on the network in accordance with routing information accessible at the user location, wherein the vendor product information is returned to the user location for processing (col. 2, line 51 – col. 3, line 12 and col. 5, line 57 – col. 6, line 11: teaches from extracting the URL or other network information identifier (unique code) identifying a web site at a server (remote location) and wherein a web page (vendor information) is delivered to the computer for display).

However, Bendinelli does not explicitly disclose the unique code in recorded information of the compact disk, and the unique code will be output during normal playback of the compact disk and within the video/audio bandwidth thereof. Ullman et al. (Ullman) discloses on col. 5, lines 28-30, col. 9, lines 4-35, and col. 10, lines 4-25: teaches operating a DVD player at a user site to read a video program with embedded URLs (unique code) which is stored or recorded in a digital video disk and video program is displayed on the user site. Ullman also discloses the URLs (unique codes) identifying the Web site and time stamps are sent automatically to the desktop of each student either during playback of a pre-recorded program or during a live event (col.10, lines 33-49). Since Ullman discloses a system for integrating video programming with the information resources of the Internet, which is similar to synchronized presentation of television programming and web content of Bendinelli, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a digital video disk (DVD) storing video program with embedded URLs and DVD player to retrieve video program to display on user site and the URLs (unique codes) identifying the Web site and time stamps are sent automatically to the desktop of each student either during playback of a pre-recorded program or during a live event as taught by Ullman, and extract a unique code to identify the location of a server corresponding that unique code, as taught by Bendinelli, in a digital computing environment. The motivation to do so would have been to provide a user friendly environment by giving customers additional information automatically through the Internet.

However, Bendinelli and Ullman do not explicitly disclose embedding a unique perceivable code, which does not contain routing information. In the same field of endeavor, Wolzien disclose an on line information provider address (unique perceivable code) embedded in a video or audio program is encoded in a vertical blanking interval, and the on line information provider address is detected and decoded from the electronic signal and used in establishing a direct signal communication link to the online information provider (thus, the address does not contain routing information) (Abstract and col. 3, line 25 – col. 4, line 48). Since Wolzien discloses address embedded in video or audio program, which is similar to a system for integrating video programming with the information resources of the Internet of Ullman and synchronized presentation of television programming and web content of Bendinelli, thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wolzien and Bendinelli and Ullman to include embedding a unique perceivable code, which does not contain routing information. Wolzien suggests that by providing automated and direct user access to online information providers through an address embedded in a video or audio program signal would obtain several benefits such as users could easily locate additional materials provided in text or still picture by the producers of the video program by accessing more information from the producers digitally through the online address.

8. As to claim 4, Bendinelli and Ullman and Wolzien (Bendinelli-Ullman-Wolzien) disclose the network is a global communication network that provides a universal

Art Unit: 2176

resource locator (URL) for each location on the network and the routing information is comprised of the URL for the location (Bendinelli, col. 2, line 51 – col. 3, line 12).

9. As to claim 5, Bendinelli-Ullman-Wolzien disclose the unique perceivable code is an audible tone (Bendinelli, col. 2, line 51 – col. 4, line 13: teaches network information identifier can be embedded in any other type of signal; Wolzien: Abstract, and col. 3, line 25 – col. 4, line 48: links video and audio program content with online video or audio information signal content).

10. Claims 2-3 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bendinelli-Ullman-Wolzien as applied to claims 1 and 4-5 above, and further in view of Hitzelberger, U.S. Patent No. 6,061,368.

11. As to claim 2, Bendinelli-Ullman-Wolzien disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described supra. However, Bendinelli-Ullman-Wolzien do not explicitly teach an intermediate location on the network for comparing the received unique code with the stored vendor routing information in the database. Hitzelberger discloses on col. 4, lines 9-56: a routing engine (intermediate location) for matching source identifiers with the destination identifiers from a cache (stored vendor routing information) in the routing engine. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a routing engine (intermediate location), as taught by Hitzelberger, to identify a web site at server using a code, as

Art Unit: 2176

taught by Bendinelli-Ullman-Wolzien, in a network environment. The motivation to do so would have been to provide a routing engine to match the source identifier with the destination identifiers stored in the cache to be able to identify the web page (vendor information) at a server for interconnection increasing the reliability in establishing connection between source and destination.

12. As to claim 3, Bendinelli-Ullman-Wolzien and Hitzelberger (Bendinelli-Ullman--Wolzien Hitzelberger) disclose the user location further includes user ID information that uniquely identifies the user location (Hitzelberger, col. 4, line 9-56: teaches a source identifier), and

wherein the database at the intermediate node includes user profiles information which is associated therein with the user ID information of the user location (Ullman, col. 3, line 44 – col. 4, line 4), and

wherein the step of transmitting the unique perceivable code over the network to the intermediate note also includes transmitting the user ID information to the intermediate location, and the step of matching further comprises matching the received user ID information of the user location with stored profile information associated with the received user ID information (Wolzien, Abstract, and col. 3, line 25 – col. 4, line 48; Hitzelberger, col. 4, line 9-56: teaches routing engine (intermediate note) which includes identifier, and a matching function for comparing source identifier with a destination identifiers stored in cache to be encoded in a packet that is transmitted to the destination), and

Art Unit: 2176

wherein the step of transmitting the matching vendor routing information back to the user location further includes appending to the vendor routing information the stored profile information, and wherein the stored profile information is transmitted to the remote vendor information location via the user location (Hitzelberger, col. 4, line 9-56).

13. Claims 6-10 have similar limitations as discussed in the method of claims 1-5; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's request for reconsideration of claim rejection – 35 USC § 112 of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the claim rejection – 35 USC § 112 is withdrawn.

15. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 09/26/2003 have been fully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment (i.e., a unique perceivable code) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

Art Unit: 2176

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 (After Final Communications only)

(703) 872-9306 (Official Communications)

(703) 746-7240 (for Official Status Inquiries, Draft Communications only)

Inquiries of a general nature relating to the general status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER